



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the years of the famine, was entrusted privately by English Protestants with the distribution of £1,500 for the relief of sufferers, on the sole condition that no difference was to be made in respect of religion. With the aid of many Protestant clergymen this sum was distributed, apart from all connection with religion; and five-sixths of it was given to Roman Catholics. This was a mere drop in comparison of the vast sums of Protestant money similarly distributed by the agency of Protestant clergymen. This may account for the fact that Irish Roman Catholics are not now anxious to get rid of a Protestant clergy at the dictation of an excited "journalist"—a fact now confessed in the *Tablet*.

This great change, thus strikingly confessed, has in our eyes a value of surpassing importance; for it indicates a state of things in which the great truths of the Word of God may be calmly and dispassionately discussed.

In ages long past, Roman Catholics in Ireland were taught to consider rebellion as a sacred duty. In ages more recent, Roman Catholics in Ireland suffered consequent penalties and disabilities, too great for human patience to endure. A better feeling has at length swept away both rebellion and penalties. Roman Catholics can now be loyal subjects, and are in possession of all the rights and privileges of the freest constitution in the world. The strife of ages is at length subsiding. Wrongs are done away, and the remembrance of them no longer excites popular passions. Never in the history of Ireland was there more peace and harmony and good-will than now exists among her people. Journalists may be indignant because men no longer believe in "woes, wrongs, and sufferings" which they no longer feel; but all who love the truth will hail with joy the happy change, and will seek to turn it to the best account by learning to promote, in a spirit of brotherly kindness and love, the discussion of the great message of God's revelation to man, important alike to his eternal felicity and his social happiness.

ROMAN WORSHIP.

We take the following from the *Tablet* of April 10th:—

ROME.

("From a letter in the *Univers*, dated March 31st.)
"The Feast of the Annunciation was celebrated on the 25th in the richly decorated Church of St. Maria Sopra Minerva. The Holy Father repaired thither *en grand gala*. There are usually only four occasions in the year for this magnificent display, of which the Romans are so fond. On the Feast of St. Philip Neri, the Chiesa Nuova; on the Nativity, the Madonna del Popolo; on the Feast of St. Charles Borromeo, the Church of St. Charles on the Corso—are the other churches which the Pope visits in this equipage of state.

"On Palm Sunday his Holiness distributed the palms in the Basilica of St. Peter. We have often expressed the pain which is caused to Catholics by the conduct of certain Protestants who consider themselves dispensed in our temples from a decent deportment in the presence of God. The Roman, who, under his patience conceals a profound contempt for the insolent offenders, does not deign to speak, and, perhaps, he is right. But the French temperament is less enduring. At the solemn moment of the Elevation an Englishman remained standing erect before a loggia which contained a person of consideration well known for his Breton faith and his respect for the Holy See: 'Kneel down, sir,' said this gentleman twice, and as the staid Englishman refused, he added, 'Send me the gendarmes.' The noble gentleman, the disciple of Luther, the zealous High Church partisan, had had the courage, in his black coat and white cravat, to insult God, and to resist a Catholic of rank, and, in case of need, he would have jered at the Pope; but the arrival of a gentleman! *Fidèle! He missed.*

"On the Annunciation the Church of St. Louis, the three naves, the choir, the side chapel, and the tribunes were all filled. The occasion was a consecration of French soldiers to Mary, and a distribution of scapulars. The worthy almoner has inspired his colleagues with that spirit of simplicity and moderation which is necessary to every durable work, and these wonders of divine grace have ceased to excite those accusations of fanaticism which the ignorance of superior officers sometimes uttered. On the contrary, these new rejoices, as every generous French heart must, at the spectacle of the glorious consecration made by our soldiers to the Romans for the examples of impiety and unbelief set by the French in days gone by."

Grand Gala. "magnificent display," "equipage of state," are necessary to religion at Rome; for the events of 1848 have made it appear that there is little else in their religion for which the Romans care. A Bishop kept in his see by foreign bayonets must try and amuse the worshippers, if he can do nothing else.

The case of the Englishman is illustrative. The con-

secrated bread and wine were "elevated" in order to be worshipped "with the same worship of Latria which is due to the true God"—(Council of Trent, *sess. xii.*, cap. 5). Perhaps he ought not to have been there at all, but we suppose it is difficult for an English traveller to resist the temptation of witnessing such exhibitions, if it be only to satisfy himself what their true character is. In such a case, to kneel down is to worship. If the Englishman did not believe that the bread and wine was God, then (whatever excuses may be attempted for others) it would clearly have been idolatry in him. The Englishman did not believe it, and therefore he did not kneel or worship. The Breton saw that the Englishman did not believe that the bread was God, yet he insisted on his kneeling and worshipping it, and sent for the police to make him kneel and worship what he did not believe in. The *Tablet* and the *Univers* are evidently delighted with the idea. Jews were once very good "Catholics" under the Inquisition. Those who will bow down to the Church of Rome may have much licence as to believing her doctrines or not, as they please. In many Roman Catholic countries all Protestants have been compelled by the police to kneel down in the streets to what they believed to be mere bread and wine when carried in procession. Perhaps this would be done in Dublin now if some people could have their will.

The "consecration of French soldiers to Mary" we suppose was effected by the scapulars. Does any enlightened Roman Catholic believe that the false stories of the scapular are the right means of correcting impiety and unbelief. Thus it ever is, however, where the Word of God is not the standard. Men vibrate between infidelity and credulous superstition, never settled in the faith of the Gospel.

In Ireland we make what show we can. We take the following also from the *Tablet* of April 10:—

HOLY WEEK IN TUAM.

"These ceremonies were performed this week in the cathedral with the usual solemnity. His grace the Archbishop pontificated on Holy Thursday, assisted by the Rev. E. Coyne, R.C.A., and Rev. P. Corcoran, R.C.C., as officiating deacon and sub-deacon. The oils were blessed, and a solemn procession of the 'Pre-sanctified' Host took place. The Host was carried by his grace, under a canopy gorgeously and richly ornamented, to the side altar, which was fitted up for the occasion in the most tasteful and costly manner. The Very Rev. P. J. O'Brien, President of St. Jarlath's College, officiated as master of ceremonies during the week."

How sincere Roman Catholics must wonder that St. Paul did not "pontificate" in the cities he visited and the churches he founded! Yet we do not ever read of St. Peter "pontificating;" nevertheless, how grand it would have sounded in the Douay Bible! What an authority it would have been for the modern worship of the Church of Rome.

If they had been at a loss for a "master of the ceremonies" we dare say one could have been borrowed without much difficulty from the Pontifex Maximus of the nearest Heathen temple, to whose religious spectacles we cannot doubt that the origin of that important office in ecclesiastical ceremonies might be easily traced.

Correspondence.

THE RULE OF CATHOLIC FAITH—WHAT IS IT? INDULGENCES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—Having shown in my two former letters that we may repudiate the whole practical teaching of the Roman Church on the subject of "Invocation of Saints," and also that we may believe, with the Church of England, that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist is only a spiritual presence, and still be orthodox, I proceed to consider another subject.

In your admirable leading article of last month you treated on the subject of "Jubilees" and "Indulgences." You defined their nature and effect very correctly from Roman Catholic books, and coupling these definitions with the practical illustrations as given in Dr. Wiseman's and Dr. Dixon's late pastorals, you came to the only reasonable conclusion that could be arrived at, viz.:—that it was "manifest to every intelligent mind that the whole affair is merely a pious fraud and a cheat."

Now, sir, this opinion will become more manifestly true when we examine the solemnly recorded opinions of Veron on the subject, so totally opposed to the doctrine and teaching enunciated in various Papal Bulls and late Pastorals of Romish prelates. The authority of Veron's work was sufficiently explained in my former letters. Veron, in his "Rule of Catholic Faith," dedicates a whole chapter to the subject of "Indulgences" (§ 4). At p. 61, he cuts at the root of the whole subject. He says:—

"No jubilee or indulgence granted by the Pope, or by council, whether plenary or otherwise, and confined to a special number of years; or particular, that is, granted for certain particular reasons, or depending on the performance of certain specified works, is an article of faith; or, in other words, the validity of no such jubilee, or indulgence, is of that certainty which is

essential to every article of faith; whilst many of these are merely probably valid; and others, which have a certain currency, have no other object but sordid gain, are scandalous, and as such, consequently, are by all means to be done away with."

"Indulgences granted by the Popes are still less of faith, even doctrinal points propounded by them."

And then Veron goes on to prove why jubilees and indulgences granted either by Pope or Council may be rejected. The practical result is, that no Roman Catholic need believe a word of these matters. Veron goes further. He clearly lays it down (p. 52) that—

"With regard to the power of granting indulgences, it is not of faith, that there is in the Church a power to grant such indulgences as actually will remit, at the tribunal of God, either in this life or in the life to come, the temporal punishment which may remain due after our sins have been pardoned; or, in other words, it is not an article of Catholic faith, that the Church can grant an indulgence, the direct effect of which shall be the remission of the temporal punishment which is due to the justice of God, and which would otherwise have to be undergone either in this life or in purgatory."

Again (pp. 57, 58):—

"It is still less a fit subject of Catholic faith, or, in other words, it is not of faith, that the Church can grant an indulgence in favour of the dead, in the true sense of an indulgence as applied to these souls, namely, as a remission of their sufferings; and it is farther still from being an article of faith, that the Church has any intention whatever of remitting these sufferings, except by way of suffrage."

He cites authorities "among Catholics writers, who deny in plain and unmodified terms that indulgences are of any use to the dead."—"The grant of indulgences is an exercise of jurisdiction. Now, as the Pope has not been appointed judge over the souls in purgatory, he has no jurisdiction over them."—"Even our private suffrages in favour of the dead are far from being necessarily beneficial to them; how much more doubt must there be as to the effect of indulgences?"

Veron explains what he means by the words "except by way of suffrage," viz., "it not being absolutely certain, nor admitted by all Catholics, that the suffering souls in purgatory can be benefited by indulgences" (p. 59).

In another place (p. 45), he says that these indulgences, even "by way of suffrage," are "by no means certain."

You showed us that the bank on which the Pope is supposed to draw, in order to meet the drafts in favour of the recipients of these indulgences, is "the treasures of the Church," composed of superabundant merits of Jesus Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and all the saints. If the coffers of this bank be as empty as those of the late "Royal British," then, indeed, would the whole affair be "a pious fraud and a cheat."

Now Veron gives us some information on this subject also. He says (p. 45):—

"It is not an article of faith that there is in the Church a treasure composed of the satisfactions of the saints; and, consequently, it is not of faith, that indulgences, whether in favour of the living or the dead, are granted, by making them partakers of that treasure."

After citing the famous bull of Clement VI. in his "Extravag. Unigenitus," which refers to all these supposed merits, Veron sweeps away the whole as a private opinion—as of no authority. "After all," he says, "the Pope is not a general council; and consequently the above extract is not sufficient to establish an article of faith;" in other words, may be repudiated by an orthodox "Catholic."

He cites the names of several doctors, who repudiate the notion of the existence of such imaginary treasure in the Church, and concludes thus:—

"From this opinion it follows, as a necessary consequence, that the treasure of the Church is not formed of satisfactions of the saints; and that an indulgence is not an application of any of these satisfactions, towards the remission of the temporal punishment due to sin" (p. 46).

And to avoid the possibility of mistake, he puts the same proposition in other words:—

"The existence of a treasure in the Church, composed of the satisfactions of the saints, is not to be admitted as an article of our faith" (p. 47, Waterworth's translation, Birmingham, 1833). So that, take the subject of indulgences and jubilees which way you will, the whole teaching, as above set forth, and indeed the ordinary teaching of Romish theologians, may be rejected.

This is what may be called *negative* Romanism, for, on the other hand, it is permitted to the faithful to believe part or all of the several propositions as firmly as any of the other points of his creed, and be equally orthodox.

What, then, is *positive* Romanism on this head? Simply, that an orthodox Romanist must believe "that there is in the Church a power received of God to grant indulgences." What that power is, to whom or to what it extends, or what an indulgence is, it is not necessary to know or inquire into, because the Council of Trent did not take upon itself to define. Veron's private opinion is, that an indulgence can only extend to "a

mission of the penances prescribed by the Church" (p. 51). So that if Dr. Wiseman prohibit the use of dripping, hard, or cheese, &c., on particular days, an "indulgence" by way of dispensation may be granted to permit us to indulge in these luxuries on the otherwise *banian* days; or if a particular penance be enjoined, such as saying so many "Ave marias" a-day, &c., this may be commuted into a fine, &c., &c.

So that indulgences, like the doctrine of the "real presence," as supposed to be taught by the Romish Church, is a myth, and the belief or disbelief of either, according to Veron, can be no possible objection to our being good "Catholics."

Your correspondent, "A Catholic Layman" (p. 33), complains of the diversities of opinion existing among English divines. Just let him read Veron's "Rule of Catholic Faith," and he would soon find himself bewildered in the multiplicity of opinions upon points he has doubtless considered long since settled; he may, according to Veron, give up his great prop "Infallibility" altogether. He will thank Veron for leading him safely to the harbour of refuge, which will enable him in safety to repudiate all that superstructure essentially Romish and he will find that Protestants are not such heretics after all.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
C. H. COLLETTE.

London, April, 1858.

THE HOLY FATHERS ACKNOWLEDGE THE SUPREMACY OF ST. PETER; AND THAT THE CHURCH OR THE FOUNDATION NEVER FAILS.

(Continued from page 35.)

Objection I.—"May not we fairly conclude that the text we have been discussing affords no ground for St. Peter's supremacy, and clearly was not considered so to do by the Ancient Fathers?" (C. LAYMAN, Feb. 19, p. 18^e). Answer.—No doubt we might, had "the Ancient Fathers" stopped where you stopped them, and said no more on these texts.

II.—"That our Lord was speaking figuratively seems to us to be certain, and if so, why might He not build His Church as well on the faith confessed by Peter as on Peter himself?" (*Ibid*, Feb. 18, 1858, p. 22.) Answer.—I know not why He might not, but I know He did not, from His own words: "where the word *faith* appears not; and if this, and St. Peter's supremacy, were not believed by the Council of Chalcedon, why, when St. Peter was called "the rock of the Catholic Church, and the foundation of the *orthodox faith*, was this proceeding sanctioned by all the bishops?" (Evangius. Hist. lib. ii. c. xviii.) Because, say you, "they were not so ill-bred as to interrupt" it. Answer.—Does this mean that our expression of dissent, when our faith is impugned, is silenced by "good breeding," and that religion is a mere farce? which would be good news for the Atheists; the conception is beautiful, and it is well if the practice does not follow. However, the Council of Chalcedon was before the year 1517, and therefore needed a Reformation to overawe it into the setting aside of our Lord's precept: "He who denies me before men, &c., for that of Lord Chesterfield.

You are still harping on that idle question of "where the supreme authority in matters of faith is lodged." The last words of Matt. xvi. 18 are chiefly relied on for this. See, then, how these words are understood by Origen in the passage above, and be satisfied with it. In every division the Catholic Church is found with the chair of Peter—there will I also be found. This is my text; it is quite clear, and visible as the Vatican. But you appeal to Scripture and to the ante-Nicene divines for your doctrine of the Trinity: you appeal from the living to the dead. On what authority is the conveyance of Scripture, or the knowledge that its true canon is neither more nor less than you have it? Is not the great Dr. Walton, when he tells you, in his *Prol-gomena*,¹ that "the Revelation, and some other parts of the New Testament, were doubted of for some ages," far honest than the sixth Article, which, "In the name of Holy Scripture, understands those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority there was never any doubt in the Church?" An instance of insincerity unparalleled even by the forgery of the Decretals, about which you talk so much. And as for the ante-Nicene writers, see how Origen speaks of the Son.

Before leaving the evidences of St. Peter's supremacy I must advert to other Scripture testimonies which ought not to be passed by. Thus, in the catalogues of the Evangelists he is not only the first named, but called "the first." "Now, the name of the Apostles are these, the first Simon, who is called Peter," &c.—Matt. x. 2. Secondly.—In Acts i. he evidently showed his authority; and again, in Acts xv., when "all the multitude were silent" (*ibid*. 12) after his speech; which was the first. For this I have SS. Jerome and Chrysostom for my witnesses.

St. Peter's supremacy being thus established, as well as the traditional fact that he occupied the episcopal chair at Rome (CATHOLIC LAYMAN, Jan. 15, 1858; p. 8), there is

no way of depriving the Bishops of Rome of their title to be his successors, except by proving that this part of the Divine institution was not to be continued. But we know, by tradition, that the other parts of our Saviour's institution were continued; and to make an exception to this would be only to show to what extremities even great wits may be driven before they will stand self-condemned. That the Bishop of Rome is the successor of St. Peter is the universal tradition of the Catholic Church.

The learned Dr. Pearson, Bishop of Chester, has fully proved this. (Oper. Posthum. p. 27-31, 1688, Lond.) In the second age, St. Irenæus says, "The great Church of Rome was founded by the glorious Apostles, SS. Peter and Paul, who delivered the episcopacy to Linus, whose successor was Anacletus," &c. (Lib. iii. c. 3.)

In the third century, St. Cyprian calls Rome "the chair of Peter," &c. (Ep. 55.)

In the fourth, St. Optatus: "In the city of Rome—Peter sat first, to whom Linus succeeded." (Lib. 2.)

In the same age, Eusebius: "After the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, Linus was the first who succeeded to the episcopate at Rome." (Hist. Lib. iii. c. 2.) "Linus was the first, after Peter, that obtained the episcopate at Rome." (*Ibid*, c. 4.)

Also, St. Epiphanius: "After (Peter and Paul) came Linus; then Cleus" (or Anacletus). (Lib. 1.)

And St. Augustine: "To Peter succeeded Linus," &c. (Ad Genesim.)

St. Jerome: "Clement was the fourth bishop of Rome, after St. Peter; for the second was Linus," &c. (Lib. Script. Ecclesiast. c. 15.)

St. Prosper, in the fifth century, calls Rome "the see of Peter." (Carm. de Ingratis.) See also St. Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. 6); St. Ambrose (Lib. 4, Hexameron, c. 8.) &c., &c.

With many thanks for the CATHOLIC LAYMAN with which you have favoured me,

I remain, respected Sir,
Yours, sincerely,

WILLIAM GERAGHTY, M.D.

[We have now printed, in our last number and the present, our correspondent's long string of quotations, though we confess we do not see what object they really serve, or how they contravene anything we have written.

That St. Peter is spoken of in very eulogistic terms, and deservedly so, by nearly all the fathers, we readily grant and never denied. That some of them treat him as the rock on which the Church is built we ourselves stated in our 5th article on the See of Peter, so far back as December, 1856. Nevertheless, it is equally true that there are many more passages in the fathers which interpret the same passage differently; and Dr. Geraghty has not yet attempted to disprove Father Launoy's assertion that 44 of the fathers treat the Church as built on the *faith* which Peter confessed, and not on Peter's person. Dr. Geraghty, indeed, in a note to his new letter,² tries to make light of the distinction between St. Peter's person and the faith which he confessed, as one which "the Council of Trent lays no stress on," and which is a mere unmeaning distinction which some modern controversialists (meaning, we suppose, the CATHOLIC LAYMAN among others) have endeavoured to make for the sake of blinding (R.) Catholics.

Now, it does so happen that the distinction is not one started by us, or any other Protestant, for the purpose of blinding Roman Catholics, or otherwise; but first, we believe, suggested by St. Ambrose, in the very passage which, whimsically enough, Dr. Geraghty himself has quoted in the commencement of his present letter (p. 34, column 2, of our last number): "Not of Peter's self, but of his *faith*, was it said that the gates of hell, &c.;" and in modern times more fully pointed out by the learned Father Launoy, himself a staunch Roman Catholic, in an elaborate treatise in the 5th volume of his works, part 2, p. 99, in which he triumphantly exposes the uncandid and wilful misrepresentations of Cardinal Bellarmine, who had most unfairly represented all the fathers as agreeing in the interpretation that the Church was built on St. Peter alone.

As to the distinction being an unmeaning one, the assertion obviously refutes itself. Our blessed Lord was speaking figuratively as to the foundation on which He was about to build His Church, and no more significant or important distinction could be taken than whether the *man* He was addressing was to be made that foundation personally, as the modern advocates of Rome pretend, or whether the creed or confession of faith, which Peter had just professed, was to be the foundation. In the one case, Peter might be everything; in the other case nothing. The truth he confessed, and not the confessor, being the immovable "rock" on which the Church was to be founded just as we suggested in a former number³ the Church of England may be said to be built on the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, or the Church of Germany on the Confession of Augsburg.

Dr. Geraghty heaps together a number of quotations from the fathers, some of whom are of great note, others comparatively obscure, and of little weight in such a controversy. We might, perhaps, classify them thus.—

1st. Those which speak of St. Peter as him to whom the "keys of the kingdom of Heaven were given."

2nd. Those in which he is spoken of as the "rock" on which the Church was built, or to be built; and

3rd. Those in which he is spoken of as having "supremacy" over the universal Church—at least, according to Dr. Geraghty's translation of the passages.

As to the first, we must content ourselves with referring back to what we have already written in our fifth article on the See of Peter (5th vol. CATHOLIC LAYMAN, p. 136, December, 1856), where we showed by extracts from St. Jerome, Origen, St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, and others, that *all* the Apostles, and not St. Peter alone, received "the keys of the kingdom of Heaven." As to the second class, we have already spoken; and as to the third, they appear to reduce themselves only to two passages—one from St. Chrysostom, the other from St. Augustine, in which the word "supremacy" occurs, at least in Dr. Geraghty's translations, and which may deserve or require a little more minute attention at our hands.

The first question will be, is the word *supremacy* the correct translation. The second: if so, whether that word was used by those eminent fathers in the same sense now contended for by the Church of Rome.

Let us first take St. Augustine, and see what is the word which Dr. G. translates "*supremacy*." The edition quoted by Dr. G. is not the ordinary Benedictine edition, nor, after consulting several reprints of that edition, have we been able to verify his references to T. iii., p. 2470, T. iv., p. 1733, given in his letter of last month, p. 34, column 3, there being no such pages in any edition that we have access to. We have, however, found in Tom. iv., p. 1215 (of the original Ben. Ed.; Paris, 1680), a passage in Psalm viii., Enarratio. c. 1., which, we have no doubt, is that which Dr. G. refers to as in Tom. iv., p. 1733.

It is as follows:—

"For as some things are said, which may appear properly to appertain to the Apostle Peter, which are, nevertheless, not clearly to be understood, unless when they are referred to the Church, of which he is acknowledged to have been figuratively the personification, on account of the precedence (or primacy) which he had among the disciples, such as, 'I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' and such like; so Judas in a certain manner personified the Jews, who were enemies of Christ, who both then hated Him and now hate Him by succeeding perseveringly to Judas's impiety."

That is, as St. Peter was the foremost of all the disciples in good; so Judas was the first in evil. Peter was the personification of the Church, the true followers of Christ; Judas the personification of his enemies and their successors for ever.

What a passage to bring forward in proof of Papal supremacy. *Primatus* is the only word which gives the faintest colour to it, and we have already shown in our last number on the *precedency* of Rome that the "first place," or "primacy," no more proves power or jurisdiction, than the acknowledged primacy of Armagh proves jurisdiction in that see over the see of Dublin, or the primacy of Canterbury that its Archbishop is the ecclesiastical ruler of the Archbishop of York.

If the foregoing passage from St. Augustine were not clear enough in itself, his meaning would be made so by another passage on the same subject, which our readers may find in his 50th Treatise on St. John's Gospel, c. 12.—Ben. Ed., Paris, 1680, tom. iii., pt. ii., p. 633.

"When Peter received the keys, he signified the Holy Church; and if the good in the Church were signified in the person of Peter, so the wicked in the Church were signified in the person of Judas."

If there be, therefore, a "*supremacy*" of good in St. Peter, there is a "*supremacy*" of wickedness in Judas.

The only other passage in which supremacy is mentioned, according to Dr. Geraghty's translation, is from St. Chrysostom. It is taken from his 5th homily concerning *repentance*.—Tom. ii., p. 309 (lib.). Ben. Ed., Paris, 1718.

The word which Dr. Geraghty translates *supremacy* is *επιεξια*, which is a word of, at least, doubtful import, which, according to the most eminent lexicographers, signifies primarily mere "inspection," or "care;" though, occasionally, it may imply something more, "superintendence," or "command." In the present instance, it is clear from the context that the former is the meaning, as St. Chrysostom is treating of St. Peter's restoration after his triple sin of denying our Lord, and our Lord's command to "feed His sheep and lambs," where "*care*," and not "*rule*," was clearly the leading idea, as we have already shown in a former article—(CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. vi., p. 18.)

As to Dr. Geraghty's argument from the Council of Chalcedon, it appears to us, and will probably also appear to our readers, singularly infelicitous, if they will only take the trouble of refreshing their recollections on the subject, or, at any rate, of reading the brief account of some of the things said and done at that great Council, which we have given in another page of our present number, and which we think we may leave to speak for itself.

We must defer till some other occasion the Scripture testimonies as to the alleged supremacy of St. Peter,

¹ John xxi., 15, &c.

² 1447.

³ Matt. xvi. 13.

⁴ St. Ev. greg. says, 620.

⁵ Cap. W., sect. 6, p. 81.

⁶ Matt. xxviii. 19, and John xx. 22, 23.

⁷ See next page.

⁸ Feb., 1858, p. 22.